

---

**From:** Tabor, Brock N (DEC) <brock.tabor@alaska.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 03, 2015 2:53 PM  
**To:** Szlag, Matthew  
**Subject:** RE: Relative Source Contribution Question

Thanks. Like I said, no rush. I'll be out of the office from the 7<sup>th</sup>-25<sup>th</sup>.

Cheers,  
Brock

---

**From:** Szlag, Matthew [mailto:Szlag.Matthew@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 03, 2015 12:35 PM  
**To:** Tabor, Brock N (DEC)  
**Subject:** RE: Relative Source Contribution Question

Hi Brock,  
Thanks for the question. I wasn't previously aware of the approach Texas took, so I'll ask around a bit and try to find some more information and get back to you soon.

Managed to avoid all the post-Thanksgiving craze by spending the long weekend up on Vancouver Island mountain biking and exploring the coast. We had unusually great weather, so it was pretty nice. Hope you enjoyed some time off too.

---

**Matthew Szlag | Water Quality Standards Coordinator**  
**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 10**  
**1200 6th Avenue, Suite 900, OWW-191 | Seattle, WA 98101**  
**P: (206) 553.5171 | [szlag.matthew@epa.gov](mailto:szlag.matthew@epa.gov)**

---

**From:** Tabor, Brock N (DEC) [<mailto:brock.tabor@alaska.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 1:05 PM  
**To:** Szlag, Matthew <[Szlag.Matthew@epa.gov](mailto:Szlag.Matthew@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Sonafrank, Nancy B (DEC) <[nancy.sonafrank@alaska.gov](mailto:nancy.sonafrank@alaska.gov)>  
**Subject:** Relative Source Contribution Question

Matt,  
Hope you had a good Thanksgiving and have been able to avoid the shopping madness that comes from urban living.

Since it appears that you have become our default EPA go-to person on HHC issues, I have a potentially challenging question:

Texas revised its HHC in 2011 and chose to use childhood exposure values rather than adult exposure values. These include a body weight of 15 kilograms, a water consumption rate of 0.64 liters/day and a fish consumption rate of 5.6 grams/day. What is interesting is that they chose NOT to use an RSC because that childhood values would represent a more scientific approach and use of childhood exposure and default 0.20 for noncarcinogens would be overly conservative- their (Tx) opinion.

Has EPA Region 10 considered the implications of other states making the same choice of using 2015 childhood rather than adult exposure values and foregoing RSC? Do you happen to know whether Region 6 is going to make Texas update their criteria with the default RSC value?

Obviously it has implications for us and our approach.

Not a rush for an answer as we plan to talk about RSC in late January/February but I would like a definitive answer nonetheless.

Thanks,

Brock Tabor

[brock.tabor@alaska.gov](mailto:brock.tabor@alaska.gov)

Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation

Division of Water: Water Quality Standards, Assessment & Restoration

(907) 465-5185

<http://www.dec.alaska.gov/water/wqsar/index.htm>

